# Wastewater Treatment Capital Planning Performance Audit

King County Auditor's Office

Valerie Whitener, Principal Management Auditor

David Reynolds, Management Auditor

September 23, 2003

### Summary of Findings

- WTD capital program management practices vary in quality
  - Some practices inconsistent with public industry standards for best management
  - Improvements proposed or underway
- Information/data to support improved management, oversight, and accountability needs to be presented in a more useable format

# Background: King County Wastewater Treatment Division

- Provides wastewater treatment services to 18 cities and 15 sewer districts
- Serves 1.4 million citizens in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties
- Implements Regional Wastewater Services Plan
  - □ Adopted by council in 1999
  - □ 30-year capital improvement plan

### Audit Objective 1

- How well does WTD manage its capital program?
  - □ Review industry best practices
  - □ Determine whether WTD follows these practices – review sample of WTD projects
  - □ Identify areas for improvement

### Objective of Best Practices: Achieve goals at lowest life-cycle cost and least risk

- Six key best practices:
  - Determine gap between capacity and planned results
  - Evaluate alternatives
  - Integrate organizational goals into decision making
  - Establish review and approval framework supported by analysis
  - □ Track costs, schedule, performance
  - Evaluate results/incorporate lessons learned

### Overview of WTD Performance

Meets	Partially Meets Improvements In Progress	Partially Meets Improvements Proposed	Limited or No Improvements Proposed
	Progress		Improvements
	<b>√</b>		
		<b>✓</b>	
		<b>√</b>	
		<b>✓</b>	
		<b>✓</b>	
			✓
			✓

### Determine the gap between existing capacity and planned results

- Understand capacity impacts and asset condition
- Ensure optimal timing of refurbishment

#### Findings:

- No comprehensive system to analyze assets
- WTD Improvements Underway
  - Centralized asset management function
  - Pilot inventory projects
  - Conveyance inventory completed

### Establish a review and approval framework supported by analysis

- Decisions supported with detailed economic analysis
  - ☐ Life-cycle cost analysis
    - \*Discount rate
    - \*Cost of capital
    - \*Sensitivity analysis
  - Social and rate impacts identified
- Rank projects/investments

#### Findings:

- Economic analysis guidelines lacking
- Countywide discount rate policy absent
- Project ranking process newly established in 2003

# Evaluate results and incorporate lessons learned

- Monitor project scope, schedule, and budget
  - Cost and timeline estimates met
  - Origin and cost of change orders understood
  - □ Technical goals of project met

#### Finding:

Post project reviews conducted on ad-hoc basis.

# Recommendations to enhance WTD initiatives

- 1. Integrate existing asset condition into analysis of capital planning alternatives.
- Develop analysis guidelines and countywide discount rate policy.
- 3. Report impact on rates for major projects.
- 4. Refine project prioritization and ranking to include consideration of rate impact and existing asset information.
- Implement post project review.



Develop a framework for providing wastewater capital project and capital program data to decision makers.



#### Questions to Answer:

- What wastewater data do decision makers need?
- Can WTD data systems track and manage this data?
- What is the best way to report this data to decision makers?

### What Data Do Decision Makers Need?

- Data user survey
  - □ Identified key data elements needed by councilmembers, council staff, and OMB staff
- Best management practices review
  - Identified key data elements needed to support best management practices
- Wastewater capital project prioritization process review
  - Identified key data elements needed to support project selection and prioritization at WTD
- Data needs were almost identical

### What Data Do Decision Makers Need?

- Program Summary Data
  - Cost and schedule overruns
    - By project category, size, duration, year or initiation, year of completion
  - Change orders
    - By cost adjustment category, including avoidable costs, unavoidable costs, and change orders as a percentage of the original contract
- Project-Specific Data
  - Information on project background, scope, schedule, and budget

### Findings – Data Management

- The WTD has most data that decision makers need. However...
  - Only a portion is tracked centrally
    - The remainder is scattered across reports and data systems
  - □ Control is inadequate
    - There is no standard protocol for data entry and there is no data dictionary
  - Tracked data is underutilized in assessing performance program-wide

15

# Recommendations – Data Management

- 6. The WTD should ensure that its new data system currently in development can capture, track, and report all needed data.
- The WTD should establish a standard data management protocol to ensure data quality.
- The WTD should develop standard processes for analyzing its data and providing clear overviews of program performance.

### Findings – Data Reporting

- The WTD meets most reporting requirements specified by code. However...
  - □ Existing reporting requirements do not meet the needs of decision makers
  - Existing reporting requirements may be unduly burdensome for the agency

# Recommendations – Data Reporting

- 9. The WTD should work with decision makers to refine and/or implement the sample reporting data set developed by our office.
- 10. The WTD should work with decision makers to update code requirements for wastewater capital reporting.

18

#### Conclusion

- Final recommendation
  - 11. WTD report on progress October 2004
- KCAO wishes to thank management and staff of the:
  - Wastewater Treatment Division
  - Office of Management and Budget
  - Finance and Business Operations Division, DES
  - Councilmembers and staff